



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IS THE BOOK OF HOSEA EXILIC?

BY EDWARD DAY
Wichita, Kansas

There is something astounding to us, when we stop to reflect upon it, in the way in which scholars have brought down most of the Old Testament literature into the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era. The discovery of the composite character of the so-called Books of Moses has not been more surprising to many than the late dates given to J and E and especially to P; while many more have been amazed to find scholars assigning the Book of Job, the Psalms, the Proverbs, Daniel, Esther and other parts of the Hebrew Scriptures to the exilic and even to the post-exilic time and in so doing marshaling data to support their conclusions that seem incontrovertible. In alluding to this crowding forward of the Old Testament literature, a movement not without its parallels in New Testament criticism, a foreign biblical scholar has significantly remarked that "there is an increased tendency to assign more of the Old Testament literature to the Persian and even to the Maccabean age."¹ It would appear that this growing tendency to find late dates for this literature, which to most scholars a dozen years ago seemed to have reached its limit, stopped but temporarily. And so, while they have allowed themselves to be drawn aside by the fascinating lure the rich finds of the Euphrates and Tigris valleys have placed before them, others have gone on in their work and have come to feel, as they have done so, that even the late dates assigned to much of the Old Testament were not late enough, that books which only a few years ago were supposed to belong to the seventh and the sixth centuries B. C. must be brought down two or three hundred years further. I am not alone, I find, in harboring the growing conviction that little save the JE narratives survived the fall of Samaria and Jerusalem, that the deuteronomic writings were exilic,²

¹ Stanley A. Cook.

² "The Promulgation of Deuteronomy," *JBL*, 1902; "Deuteronomic Judgements of the Kings of Judah," *JTS*, October, 1909, Oxford, England.

and that most, if not all, the prophetic writings were later even than the deuteronomic.

This paper is an attempt to set forth data that for several years have led me to believe that the Book of Hosea is exilic, that it, in common with Amos, Micah, Isaiah, etc., once supposed, and still supposed by many, to be pre-exilic, was really an exilic book and that presumably it belonged to the Persian time, the unknown author having for various reasons, which may easily be surmised, dated his book back a few hundred years, while denouncing the civic disorders and unhappy social and religious conditions which still existed in his day and which did not differ materially from the disorders and conditions of the earlier time. The data which I present are so new and so in conflict with our commonly accepted thought of the exilic time that they must, if accepted, prove revolutionary to any save those who in common with Dr. Torrey and Dr. H. P. Smith have come to question seriously some of the earlier stories of the return of the *Golah* and the restoration of the land and its cities. We shall have to admit, if we accept them, that the major part of the people, both north and south, survived the fall of Samaria and Jerusalem, and that under Persian satraps the land and its cities recovered in part very slowly, despite the troublous times and the loss of those most capable of leading in economic, social and religious affairs; but that the long exile of the more cultured classes meant the development in foreign parts, both east and west, Assyria standing usually in the prophetic writings of those times for the East and Egypt for the West, of a far higher type of Yahwism than the people had heretofore known.

This new Yahwism first found its way back to Canaan through that early zionistic wave, known to us as the deuteronomic. The inspiring teachers of this school having edited the historical chronicles after their peculiar fashion, compiled their legal code, reinforcing it with hortatory addresses, and, having alluded to various deuteronomic reformations in their people's past, told the story of the finding of their law-book and of a reformation under Josiah, to which it was supposed to have led, to give credence to it. This zionistic deuteronomic movement may have lasted a century or it may far more quickly have exhausted itself. It must have met with the

indifference which is so characteristic of "the immobile East," and must have depended largely for its influence or success upon the return of small companies of the more pious and cultured of the *Golah* who from time to time with high hopes for a new day of Yahweh returned to rebuild their institutions upon broader and deeper foundations. Apart from the land, engaged abroad in manufacture and trade, they had ceased to care for the old agricultural deities. Their new Yahwism met their needs and satisfied them. It remained for them as they returned to win their people at home to it and to separate them from all those practices which had become abhorrent to them. This work of restoration went on all the more slowly during the Persian period because there were contrary currents, movements on the part of the people abroad that largely offset the advantages gained by the return of such of the *Golah* as found their way back. During these years thousands of the people must have gone both east and west in the hope of bettering their economic condition and perchance of finding a home in regions less turbulent than Canaan was during large portions of the Persian period.

We shall see that the author of the Book of Hosea, like other prophetic writers of those centuries and of the Greek period, not only endeavored to lure home the *Golah* in passages most radiantly optimistic but also sought most persistently to stem the tide flowing toward other lands. It was a time that demanded leadership in their social and religious life; and I conceive the Book of Hosea to be the work of a thinker of no small magnitude. He was what his people needed, a man of letters and a religious teacher, rather than a statesman or political haranguer. His work, as he conceived of it, was not likely to bring him into conflict with the civic authorities, especially if he published pseudonymously and avoided the mention of persons in power. My study of this prophetic piece of less than three thousand words, the length of an average sermon, forbids my accepting it as made up of outlines of public addresses covering many years of labor, and years, too, when a public speaker out of sympathy with the authorities might easily have incurred their disfavor. I believe it to be a sort of tractate, written perhaps at a sitting, in white heat, by an intense Israelitish patriot, reformer and

spiritual guide of his people. It is a piece of literature that was lighted up by rare imaginative touches, despite some gross and revolting similes, and warmed with intensest feeling. It was not without many literary blemishes when judged by more classic standards than were known to the author; but its high ethical tone and its keen appreciation of economic and social values give it no little interest for us today.

One reason which I have for regarding this prophetic piece a late pseudepigraphic work is that there is no trace of this name (הושע) in the historical records of either the eighth or seventh century B. C. Neither in the reign of Jeroboam II, or the later kings of North Israel, is there mention of him. In the annals of Jeroboam II we read of יונה בן-אמתי הנביא אשר מגת החפר הושע; but הושע is not alluded to.³ Nor does such a prophet appear in the narratives of the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah of Judah half a century later. If I am reminded that this is true of Amos, I can only reply that it is true and that this is one reason which I find for assigning the book which bears this name to a late date.⁴ If such a prophet as Hosea actually existed and bore a prominent part in the affairs of that early time we would naturally expect to come upon some allusions to him, especially as the narratives of the kings of Israel and Judah appear to be prophetic in character; but we find none such.

The name הושע (deliverance) is not an altogether improbable one, for it is given as that borne by one of the heroes of Israel's past, as we see from Num. 13:8, 16 and Deut. 32:44. This is not the common form of the name as it appears in ancient legend; יהושוע, however, is from the same verbal root. It is likely that the divine name יה, used here as a prefix, represents an afterthought. הושע also curiously enough appears as the name of the last king of Israel, presumably as a nickname; for it is hardly to be supposed that it could have been his real name. What we have specially to notice is that it is significant that this name should appear as the name of the author of this prophetic piece because it is strangely suited to the book in which, despite its threats and warnings and its oracles of doom, if taken as it stands before critical literary surgery has cut away its choicer portions, the thought of deliverance is

³ II Kings, 14:25.

⁴ *AJSL*, XVIII, pp. 65 f.

predominant. These optimistic passages are sublime assurances of deliverance. The *Golah* are to be saved; and the land and its cities to be redeemed. Even if with certain scholars we delete important passages which in their particularity and their radiant hopefulness are "unquestionably from the exilic times,"⁵ we still have many such characteristic minor assertions left, such as: 6:1-3, 11b; 8:10; and 13:4, 9f, where we have the assertions: "for in me is thy help" and "I am now thy king and I will save thee in all thy cities." Even if we delete these and kindred passages and so seriously mutilate this prophetic piece of literature we should still have Yahweh's love for his people set forth by such strong statements and by such vivid imagery that it would not seem wholly inappropriate to have the name "Deliverance" stand as the name of the author of it. But I am unwilling, as will elsewhere appear, though I accept these zionistic, or messianic, passages as evidences of the late date of this little book, to delete them. Retaining them I find it rings with the joyous note of deliverance, that its many minor strains are well-nigh lost in this great and predominant note of deliverance.

The title of this book has been looked upon of late with no little disfavor. Some scholars are unwilling to accept it as it stands. They have no objection against the first half: **דבר־יהוה אשר** **היה אל־הושע בן־בארי**; but they do feel that the latter half cannot have been a part of the original title: **בימי עזיה יוחם אחז** **יחזקיה מלכי יהודה ובימי ירבעם בן־יואש מלך ישראל**.⁶ Not only is there failure here to name the later kings of North Israel, but the kings of Judah who are named in connection with Jeroboam belonged to a time some two generations subsequent to that king. It is unreasonable to suppose that a prophet whose literary remains are gathered in this little book could have had a public career of between fifty and seventy years. Wellhausen very truly says: "Aber der Synchronismus der judäischen und israelitischen Könige—der noch dazu kein richtiger Synchronismus ist—ist nicht alt, und die beiden Daten, aus denen er sich zusammensetzt, sind irrig."⁷ But if this latter part of the title is late, may not the remainder of it be? To

⁵ Harper, *Amos and Hosea*, clxi.

⁶ Wellhausen, *KP*, pp. 96 f.; Harper, *op. cit.*, pp. 201 f.

⁷ *KP*, pp. 96 f.

me the title as it stands is about what might be expected if the late author of the book wished to date his work back in the earlier time. He would be likely to name his kings in a somewhat haphazard way, careful only to mention those who ruled, both north and south, prior to the fall of their respective kingdoms. Accuracy would not be aimed at; especially as to those of the writer's contemporaries who looked back across the centuries that had intervened kings like Jeroboam II and Hezekiah loomed larger than many others. He could name Jeroboam without naming the later kings of Israel; but he could hardly think of naming Uzziah without passing on to Hezekiah. Nor do I find any evidence that the writer was not interested in Judah. Elsewhere I shall dwell upon things which lead me to believe that Judah occupied a large place in his thought; although he was on the whole less inclined to denounce the people of the South than he was to bear heavily upon those of the North.

The fact that this supposed eighth-century prophet was imaginatively conceived appears also in the narrative portions of the first three chapters. These from the old point of view have been taken to be imaginative by some scholars; but their fictitious character appears even more unmistakably if we think of the late author as so picturing his supposed prophet. He is not narrating a tragic personal experience; nor is he imaginatively describing himself as passing through such. He is describing in a way purely imaginative the supposed tragic experience of his supposed prophet of a date centuries prior to his own time. This picture of unhappy wedded life which was designed, as worked out, to make vivid the unworthiness of Israel and Yahweh's great love and wonderful forbearance, may here be re-examined for the sake of the light such study may throw upon our discussion of the place and date of the book.

Despite the efforts of scholars to prove the contrary, the fact remains that this supposed prophet is conceived of as ordered to marry an impure woman. לך קה־לך אשת זנונים is really equivalent to: "Go and marry a whore." It has been remarked by Dr. Harper that "a wife of whoredoms" was "not one who was unchaste at the time of marriage, because (a) Hosea would scarcely have attributed such a command to Yahweh."⁸ But may we not

⁸ Harper, *op. cit.*, p. 207.

think of a late author as imaginatively picturing his prophet as having been so commanded? He may not have expected his people to take him literally. Dr. Harper gives as another reason for not taking the command literally: "(b) this would be inconsistent with the symbolic representation which makes Israel (and, therefore, the woman) at first faithful." But may not an unchaste woman who for some years is supposed to be true to her husband, after once he has married her, rescuing her from a life of shame, the more reasonably after all be conceived of as standing symbolically for Israel? Another reason given for refusing to take the command literally is "(c) the ordinary word **זנה** would better have been used." True; but such awkward constructions as **אשת זנונים** are not exceptional in the Old Testament (see **אשה זנה**, in Lev. 21:7).

The names given the wife and her father and those given later to her children are such as to reveal the imaginative character of the narrative and to reinforce our conclusion that the whole narrative is late. **גמר** (completion or perfection), the name of the supposed wife, is not such a name as a real Israelitish woman could be expected to bear; nor is **דבלים** (double-cake), the name of the supposed father, a real personal name; while the names given the children, according to the narrative, are as preposterous as the names Isaiah is said to have given his children: **יזרעאל** (Jezreel), **לא רחמה** (no-mercy); **לא-עמי** (not-my-people). I agree with Wellhausen, who remarks: "Gomer und Diblaim sind völlig undurchsichtige Eigennamen, und als solche interessant;"⁹ but I cannot say that such names really were characteristic of the time. And I cannot call attention to **עמוס** as a proper name belonging to the period; for **עמוס**, as I have elsewhere suggested, is probably a name invented and given a supposititious prophet. The first son was to bear the name **יזרעאל**, not because of its significance, but because Yahweh was to visit the blood shed at **יזרעאל** upon the house of Jehu (**יהוא**) and to cause the kingdom of the house of Israel to cease. The name the daughter was said to bear was equally improbable as a name actually borne, **לא רחמה** (unpitied). The second son was to be called **לא-עמי** (not-my-people), another preposterous name.

But the first three chapters, which form a section by themselves,

⁹ *KP*, p. 97.

apart from the title, the names of the supposed actors, and the nature of the part which the prophet is made to play, bear many marks of being late as well as purely imaginative. The thought of the people and of the land as guilty of whoredom, of infidelity to Yahweh, 1:2, because other gods than Yahweh were worshiped by the people is a late thought. It at least is not earlier than the Deuteronomists, who seem to have been responsible for it, as we see from Deut. 31:16; Ex. 34:15, 16; Judges 2:17; 8:27, 33, etc., all of which passages presumably are deuteronomic. It certainly may be seriously questioned whether there was any real intention of endeavoring to discourage such worship until the Deuteronomists with their more exclusive ideals as ardent monotheists arose and taught in the exilic time. There is no mistaking the force of the verse from which the above words are taken, though the construction is awkward. The prophet is instructed to take as wife a lewd woman and through her to beget children that will be lewd that the wife may stand forth for faithless, recreant Israel. Whom the children stand for it is not easy to decide. Presumably the symbolic language should not be pressed so far as to attempt this. It is not they, but their names, which seem to have significance. We are more concerned to fix approximately the time, to place the book which contains these three chapters where it belongs. The words "for yet a little while, and I will avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu," vs. 4, are manifestly retrospective. The author endeavors to take his people back in thought to a time prior to the fall of the house of Jehu and make them see that the end of that dynasty, which he may have confounded with the end of North Israel as a kingdom, was in the nature of a divine judgment. Thus most forcibly could he make those whom he in the late time addressed feel the peril in which they had placed themselves by their lawlessness and infidelity to Yahweh.

It is evident from 1:5 that the author was not one who lived in the time of Jeroboam II and predicted the fall of North Israel, but one who lived long subsequent thereto and so was able to look back upon that event and yet, having thrown himself in thought back into that earlier time, adopt the language of prediction. The same may be said of vss. 6 and 9. Especially is this true of the words "for I

will remove them utterly." Even in the midst of the most severe arraignment of his people the writer makes it very evident that he believes that they may be brought back to their supposed allegiance to Yahweh, 2:4-15. The people are to be pleaded with, if perchance they may be lured from their idolatry (vs. 4). They are to be hedged about and kept from their old worship (vss. 8, 9). They are to be subjected to such discipline that they will turn naturally to Yahweh their God, to whom their fathers were supposed to be loyally attached in the early time. One cannot forbear thinking that the writer had in mind not merely the discipline of foreign tyranny which the people at home were groaning under, but also, and perhaps especially, the trials and disappointments of those living abroad as exiles from their fatherland. Such trying experiences must have proved disciplinary, not alone because they would necessitate physical suffering but also because they would interrupt the observance of special feast-days and the more common religious rites without which life must have seemed impossible (vs. 13). They would also cut them off very largely from the enjoyment of the products of their fields (vss. 10, 14). Such words as we find in chap. 2:4-15 are as manifestly *post-eventum* as the most radiant zionistic passages. They have to do with things suffered by the land and people and with the social and religious conditions of the Persian time.

It seems reasonable to look upon chap. 3 as a sort of supplement to chaps. 1 and 2, a supplement in which the supposed prophet gets back the wife who had forsaken him, for though אִשָּׁה may stand for any woman without אִשָּׁה, it may also be rendered "wife." This seems from the nature of the narrative what was intended to be conveyed by the writer. Having secured her, the prophet was to shut her away from her lovers (cf. 2:8, 9). Here again we seem to have an allusion to the exilic time and to the exclusion of the people from their land and its old-time worship. יָמִים רַבִּים is indefinite, but it is in accord with Hebrew usage to regard it as referring to such a period as that of the exile.

But what, it may be asked, of the remaining chapters of the book? What of the ampler data that have to do with the moral and religious status of the people? We may look first at some of the data having to do with North Israel, more particularly the data

which have to do with the land and the political and social welfare of the people; for it was this part of the land which claimed much, though by no means all, of the author's attention, as we later on shall see. The larger part of the above-mentioned mass of data is such as leads me to believe that this prophetic writer wrote of conditions he was facing and facing not in the time prior to the fall of Samaria but long subsequent thereto. It remains to be seen whether, here and elsewhere, I can make this evident. We look, then, at the condition of things which existed in the North.

The land seems to have been suffering because of the lawlessness, greed, and want of neighborliness on the part of the people. At once we come upon the announcement of the fact that Yahweh has a controversy with the inhabitants of the land, 4:1. We learn to distinguish between such allusions in the prophetic writings and those which have to do with, or which include, the *Golah*.¹⁰ The people had displeased Yahweh by their lust and cruelty. They are charged with אלה, כחש, גנב, רצח, נאף, and other crimes.¹¹ So was the land given over to violence that the writer declared "blood touches blood," 4:2, which virtually is saying that deeds of blood follow one another in close succession. This probably was an exaggeration; but it must be accepted as calling attention to a very unhappy state of affairs. This is made more apparent by references to organized highway robbery (7:1; cf. 5:1; 6:9). This occurred not only at home; but their outlaws carried their lawlessness over into Gilead, priests and prophets, forgetful of their calling, joining in such outrage for the sake of spoil. The common greed and inhumanity of the people found classic expression in 4:1, "because there is no truth, nor goodness, nor knowledge of God in the land," (cf. 6:4, 6). The want of knowledge of Yahweh with which the people were so frequently charged seems to have referred not alone to a failure to regard him and his תורה, which in its earlier deliverances and codifications had to do with the relations the Hebrew sustained to his fellow Hebrew, but also to a want of regard for religious values generally (4:6; 5:4; 6:3, etc.). In the midst of all this social anarchy there seems to have been a failure on the part of the properly

¹⁰ See Joel 1:2, 14; 2:1; Zeph. 1:18; cf. Jer. 28:6; 29:4; Zach. 6:10.

¹¹ See 4:2; 7:1-4; 9:13; 10:13; 11:6; 12:8.

constituted authorities to administer justice in the local tribunals (5:11; cf. 7:7. See especially **עֲשׂוּק אַפְרַיִם רִצּוֹן מִשְׁפָּט**, which is happily rendered by Wellhausen: "Bedrückung und Rechtsbruch herrschen in Ephraim").

Closely connected with this prevailing greed, treachery, and lawlessness was the failure of crops and the decline in population, which last, as we shall see later, was owing more to the migrations of the people abroad than to the disorder and crime at home (7:14; 8:7; 9:11, 12, 13, 16, etc.). Even passages in which the author, reminding himself that he had dated his book back in the early time, sounds the predictive note, manifestly had in mind a glory that had departed (6:4; 13:3, etc.).

But what of Judah? Were things really so much better there? While there is not as frequent mention of lawlessness in Judah, there are allusions to an unhappy state of affairs. After alluding to the violence and infidelity to Yahweh in the North and declaring that Ephraim shall fall in consequence, this prophetic writer adds that Judah shall fall with them; we are left to infer for similar offenses (5:4 f.). The leaders, or chiefs, of Judah are specially mentioned as lawless (5:10). In 5:13 we are told that Judah saw **מַדְרֵר** (his wound or injury). This assertion virtually places Judah as an afflicted land on a plane with North Israel. This again is true of 6:4 and 11. In the first verse the question which is sadly raised as to Judah is similar to that put in the mouth of Yahweh concerning Ephraim. In the second verse, mentioned above, the assertion is that a harvest, or reckoning, is in store for Judah. Still again Yahweh, we are told, has a controversy with Judah (12:3); which may be taken as explaining why he is said to have exclaimed that he would be as rottenness to Judah and again in almost the same breath that he would be as a young lion that rends ere he leaves his victim, to this same people. It is significant that Dr. Harper substitutes **יִשְׂרָאֵל** for **יְהוּדָה** in 5:10, 12, 13, 14, and 12:3.¹² In 5:5 he lets **יְהוּדָה** stand; but omits it in 6:4.¹³ In 6:11 he takes the reference to "Judah" to be an evident gloss.¹⁴ In 12:1 he lets "Judah" stand; but he translates the statement in a way I cannot

¹² *Op. cit.*, pp. 275, 277 f., 378.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 270, 285.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 291.

accept. The words **וְיַהֲוֵה עַד רֹד עַם-אֱלֹהִים וְעַם-קְדוֹשִׁים נֶאֱמָן** may far better be rendered as Gesenius long ago suggested: "Judah yet runs wild from Yahweh and his holy ones."¹⁵ Dr. Harper's handling of the above passages may be regarded as suggesting the need of a new point of view in approaching the text of this prophetic book. From the old point of view it seems unreasonable to expect more than the most meager allusions to Judah, and those of a fairly commendatory character. If, however, we look upon this book as an exilic production of the Persian time we need not be surprised to find statements which reveal an unhappy state of things in the South as well as the North.

The rulers and chiefs of the people in both parts of Canaan, but more especially in the North, seem to have encouraged rather than restrained the people. In 5:10, as we have seen, the chiefs or rulers of Judah are likened in their lawlessness to those who remove landmarks, or boundary-stones. In 9:15, Yahweh is made to say of the chiefs or rulers that they are rebellious; but inasmuch as there is reference here to his house, which presumably was in Jerusalem, and to the wicked whom he purposed to drive therefrom, we may believe that leaders of Judah as well as of Ephraim were in his mind. In 5:1, where a note of warning was sounded against the house of the king, it is unquestionably North Israel the prophetic writer has in mind, although the term **מֶלֶךְ** may covertly have been used to designate the Persian satrap or governor. The want of character on the part of their rulers in the North appears clearly in 7:3 ff., where the people are said to gladden their king, or governor, with their wickedness and their chiefs with their falsehoods. Such heads of state, especially if they chanced to be foreign deputies, might be very ready to encourage a certain amount of lawlessness if only the taxes levied were promptly paid into their treasuries. It should be very evident that the North Israelitish line of kings had already become extinct, that Samaria had long since fallen (8:5; 10:5-7; 14:1), and that her kings were no more (7:16; 10:7, 15; 13:11). Hence such rulers as they had were petty, characterless satraps and officials of the Persian overlord. It was not safe for the author to speak plainly of these; so he used circumspectly the term **מֶלֶךְ**,

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 376.

which could be used appropriately of any ruler, and the term **שר**, which could be used of a ruler, chief, or subordinate, or even of a noble who had no official status. These rulers might not only wink at lawlessness, but they could show themselves lewd and drunken (4:18; 7:3-6). They could also do what no native king was likely to do—bring to naught the local tribunals. This universal lawlessness, rendered all the worse, especially in the North, because of the weakness and unworthiness of the rulers, seems to have accounted in part for the foreign-mania which was so offensive to the writer.

The people of Ephraim and Judah, we are told, finding themselves in distress went abroad, or sent abroad (**ילך** and **שלח** both are used). The passage, like other kindred ones in this prophetic book, is highly rhetorical. As the second clause in 5:13 (**יהודה ואת-מזר**) balances the first (**ורא אפרים את-חליו**), so perhaps the fourth should balance the third. Hence as we have **וילך אפרים אל-אשור** we should also have **וישלח יהודה אל-מלך ירב**, supplying **יהודה**. Dr. Harper, who substituted **ישראל** for **יהודה** in the second clause above, naturally inserts **ישראל** here.¹⁶ Of course it must be understood that here and throughout the book **אשור** stands for the East, as is often the case in the prophetic writings, especially in the Book of Isaiah; as Egypt stands for the West. Here we have **מלך ירב**, the hostile king, which stands for any hostile power. Nor need the passage be taken as referring to anything in the nature of an embassy; for the writer may have had in mind nothing more than the general disposition to go abroad for economic and social reasons on the part of the people both north and south who had lost interest or faith in their fatherland. This conception comes out more clearly in 7:8, where it is said of Ephraim that he has mixed himself with the peoples. They appear to have been fast losing their identity as a tribe; for not only was there a constant movement abroad, but foreigners were coming in and possessing themselves of their substance, a movement that it is to be presumed foreign satraps favored (see 7:9; 8:7; cf. II Kings 17:24 ff.). It may be that this latter passage is but a legend or folk-tale in which an effort is made to explain in the late time how it

¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 277.

was that so many foreigners were located in the North. Having been encouraged by Persian satraps to locate there, late historians of Israel might speak of them and their descendants as in the above passage. The deterioration in Ephraim, as it appears to the writer, the loss of national character through foreign admixture and the aping of foreign ways, is expressed in a forceful phrase **ענה בלי הפוכה**, a cake not baked, i. e., baked only on one side. But the author's apt characterizations do not stop here. He declares that Ephraim is like a silly timid dove. The people call upon Egypt; they go to Assyria, i. e., in their extremity they look both west and east for relief and migrate thither in increasing numbers (7:11). Having lost faith in their land and its gods they go abroad. There may have been in this verse a reminiscence of the time when their kings in Israel and Judah looked abroad for help; but covertly at least the foreign-mania of the people was rebuked (cf. 7:12-16). According to 8:8, Israel was swallowed up among the nations. It seemed to the writer apparently that the major part of the people had gone abroad, had expatriated themselves. So far removed was he from any of the forced migrations that he does not speak of these. According to 8:9 the people like a solitary ass have found their way East without a leader or guide. In doing so they have sold themselves to the nations (vss. 9b, 10a); while according to 9:17 their God is said to have cast them away because of their infidelity to him and so has forced them to become wanderers among the nations. Here the writer, changing his point of view, indulges in the thought, for evident reasons—for could he not thus discourage such migrations?—that these people who have gone abroad have virtually been cast away by their God. In 9:3 the disposition to go is so alluded to as to lead it to be inferred that the writer looked upon the movement as forced by the exigencies of their situation, owing to a failure of crops and Yahweh's displeasure: "They shall not dwell in Yahweh's land; but Ephraim shall return to Egypt, and they shall eat unclean food in Assyria." This thought that their exile had been decreed seems to find still further expression in vs. 6, where the writer exclaims: "For, lo, they are gone away unto Assyria,"¹⁷ and adds: "Egypt shall gather them up, Memphis shall bury them,"

¹⁷ I accept Wellhausen's emendation, **אשר** for **משד**, *KP*, p. 123.

thus suggesting to them the thought of the improbability of their ever returning wherever they might go. Omitting the לֹא, as we must, in 11:5, we read what the author says of Ephraim יֵשׁוּב מִלִּכְּנֹז אֶל-אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וְאַשּׁוּר הוּא מִלִּכְּנֹז, which may have the force of the present: "He returns to the land of Egypt and Assyria is his king," i. e., he spreads himself over both the East and the West. The friendliness of attitude toward foreign lands appears in 12:2, where it is declared: "and they make a covenant with Assyria, and oil is carried into Egypt." This may be in part reminiscent of old times and the disposition to endeavor to win the favor of neighboring peoples; but it is best not to take it literally, for only in the early days of the northern kingdom was there, so far as we know, any effort to curry favor with Egypt. We rather are to suppose that the author has in mind a general disposition in the late time to regard foreign nations favorably as far superior to their own. The frequent mention of Assyria, or the East, leads us to surmise that Persia, or more particularly, perhaps, Babylon, was looked upon as the coveted goal of those who dreamed of riches gotten in trade or of the wisdom secured through schools and libraries. Dr. Harper translates 13:7, "And so I will be to them like a lion, like a leopard on the way to Assyria."¹⁸ This agrees with Wellhausen, who renders the last clause, the doubtful one: "Auf dem Wege nach Assur."¹⁹ I heartily endorse this translation. Certainly, too, I must regard vs. 8 a part of the threat which was intended to discourage the emigration of the peoples abroad.

There are passages, we should not fail to notice, in which there are allusions to wealth and prosperity. We may admit, bad as things were, that the author, like other prophetic writers, took too pessimistic a view of the situation, that so far as the migrations abroad were concerned other than economic reasons were often operative, and that so far as the conditions at home were concerned, life and crops were probably more secure than he pictured them. We know northern Palestine well enough to believe that agriculturally it probably quickly responded to the farmer and recovered from the conquests which preceded the Persian period. The Book of Amos, which I take to belong to about the same time as Hosea, alluded to

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 398.

¹⁹ *KP*, p. 19.

evidences of wealth in North Israel, although the writer reveals that it was in the hands of the few rather than the many (see 4:1; 6:1, etc.). In 12:9 Ephraim is represented as saying: "Surely I am become rich, I have found me wealth." This assertion so closely follows the charge brought against him as a merchant כַּנְעַן that one is left to infer that the substance referred to had been largely secured by traffic at home or trade abroad. This statement taken alone would suggest a late date, to say nothing of the fact that the term כַּנְעַן, for trader, is unquestionably late (see Job 40:30; Zach. 14:21; Isa. 23:8; Zeph. 1:11). However gained, the writer here reveals to us the fact that there was wealth in Ephraim, despite the unsettled condition and the poverty of the masses. In harmony with this is the allusion in 8:14 to large buildings in the North, presumably private dwellings, אֲרָמֹת and הִיכָלוֹת (cf. Amos, אֲרָמֹן, 6:8; cf. 2:5, and הַבַּיִת הַגָּדוֹל, 6:11, also בֵּית־הַחֶרֶק, עַל־בֵּית־הַקֵּץ, 3:15). There is also allusion to newly walled cities in Judah, 8:14. Such prosperity as is thus alluded to, though enjoyed only by the few, may account for the pride or arrogance of which there is unfriendly mention (5:5; 7:14). In part this may have had reference to the people abroad; but surely it was not wholly addressed to them.

It seems to me we have here in the mass of data that has to do with the unsettled state of the land and the consequent want of security of life and property, with the general low tone of morals and the weakness and want of character on the part of the rulers and the nobles, and with migrations of the people to other lands, material that forces upon us the conclusion that this prophetic book cannot have been written earlier than the Persian time. That life was somewhat insecure in the North in the decades which immediately preceded the fall of Samaria we must believe; and that it was wanting in moral soundness we must also believe; but that it was as unsettled as it continued to be for two or three centuries later seems unlikely. Organized bands of highwaymen probably did not go about; nor can we believe that the administration of justice in local tribunals utterly broke down. Then, too, while the rulers were unprincipled to a considerable extent, especially in the North, it is hardly likely that they were as inclined to wink at lawlessness, or to league them-

selves with evil-doers, as in the later period the rulers were. I can understand why some scholars delete all references to an unhappy state of things in Judea or substitute Israel for Judah in such passages, because such statements, if allowed to stand, must be considered late. But I greatly prefer to let them stand; and to speak of them as data which point to the late date of the book.

Nothing, however, in the passages we have considered, more surely reveals the fact that the book is late than the allusions to the foreign-mania of the people and the constant streaming of life abroad. We may say very confidently that there were few who went either east or west to reside prior to the conquest of the land by foreign powers; nor is it likely that many went before the days of Persian supremacy or overlordship; although it is admitted that the two kingdoms learned to lean on foreign overlords long before they fell. After the conquest there seem to have been decades when under certain satraps life was more secure, more remunerative, and happier abroad than at home. So into the East, especially to Babylon, and into the West, i. e., into Egypt, the Asiatic Greek colonies, etc., the people of Israel passed. For various reasons it seemed unwise for prophetic writers of the Persian time to mention the exact destination of different migrations of their people. Perhaps they could not do so because they distributed themselves over such wide areas. To avoid unpleasantness, or for convenience' sake, Assyria came to stand for the East and Egypt for the West. The fact that they dated their writing back into the days of the kings would make it seem the more reasonable to use these geographical names.

Those who look, as I do, upon the Deuteronomists as reformers who did their work in the early exilic time, who believe, as I do, that there was no serious effort to abolish the many local shrines and the abuses which had flourished in and around them prior to their time can have no trouble with the religious data of this prophetic book. While they may admit that most things denounced flourished in the eighth and seventh centuries B. C., they see no reason for supposing that a much better state of things existed in the early Persian time. Though the Deuteronomists had labored, or were laboring, indefinitely, it is presumable they made slow work of radically changing the customs of their people and uniting them in the common

worship of Yahweh. The fact that this prophetic writer denounced most of the religious customs and practices of his day is to be noted; for these were such as were abhorrent to a devout worshiper of Yahweh.

They sacrificed and burnt incense, we are told, upon high places, the hills of the land, and under sacred trees (4:12, 15; 10:8). It is likely that such neighborhood worship long continued. Only the growing popularity of the temple service in Jerusalem in the post-exilic time and the local synagogues that were established upon the return of the *Golah* throughout the land could have reduced such popular worship to the minimum. Even now, as the late Professor Curtis has shown, there are unmistakable traces of such worship among the poor peasants of Palestine and Syria. The Baal cult is mentioned as flourishing; but Astarte does not find mention. This, however, cannot be taken as indicating any failure on the part of the people to pay homage to that popular eastern goddess; for idols, or images, are mentioned, some of which presumably were used in her worship. This prophetic writer was not so much interested in specifying the various forms of idolatry as he was in denouncing all worship of other gods as whoredom, or infidelity to Yahweh (see 4:12; 5:3; 6:10, etc.). Associated with this worship there was gross drunkenness and lewdness (4:11; 7:14; 9:4); and especially (4:13 f.) where both sexes are spoken of as going up to those high places for immoral purposes. Even in Judah things were so bad as regards such worship that a caution was addressed to the people; and there presumably the deuteronomic reformation was under way (4:15).

But despite all the attention given to other gods, Yahweh was zealously worshiped, though presumably with rites and ceremonies, and withal images, which were exceedingly offensive to such a man as the author of this book (5:6; 8:13, etc.). As in the days of another prophetic writer the zeal of the people in their Yahweh-worship was denounced as displeasing to their God (5:6; 6:6; 8:13; 9:4 f.; cf. Isa. 1:11 ff.). Indeed we read of an increase of altars, so religious were the people (8:11; 10:1; 12:12). This worship seems to have been in the hands of priests who were even more disreputable than the worshipers (4:6-9; 5:1; 6:9; 10:5).

Some of the punishments mentioned must have long before come upon them. It is presumable that the calves of Samaria had been destroyed (8:6; cf.; 10:5); that Samaria had fallen (8:5 ff.; 10:5; 14:1); and that the people no longer had a king of their own (10:7, 15). Even the migrations of the people to other lands were considered by the writer as in the nature of judgments of Yahweh (9:3 ff., 15). The time of this writer is here spoken of as a time of recompense, a day of visitation, because Yahweh was conceived of as having forsaken them and their land. When the writer prays that their women may miscarry in childbirth and that their breasts may dry up we appreciate that his feelings have overmastered him or that his pen has run wild (9:14); but beneath all his rhetorical flights we discover evidences of a state of things most distressing. Judah, he intimates, has been false to her God and cannot escape the common lot of the recreant (5:5; 6:11, etc.). The writer dwells upon Yahweh's affliction of the land in words of not a little poetic beauty; but in words that are none the less forceful because they are beautiful (4:3, 19; 6:3 f.; 8:7; 9:2, 11; 13:3).

The traces of the influence of the Deuteronomists seem to me to be numerous and to favor my conviction that we have here a late work. Not only do I find such deuteronomic phrases and clauses as reveal the influence of the deuteronomic school, or the Book of Deuteronomy; but I also find considerable sympathy with deuteronomic ideals. There are also little things here and there that lead me to suppose that the Deuteronomists were still at work in the interests of the new Yahwism and were specially endeavoring to purify and centralize worship. We may pass over the first three chapters, which are nothing if they are not in substantial sympathy with the loftier deuteronomic ideals; and may confine our attention to the remainder of the book.

There is, as we would naturally expect to find in one in sympathy with deuteronomic ideals, hostility to high places, to worship under sacred trees, and at such sanctuaries as Bethel and Gilgal (4:15; 5:8; 9:15; 10:5, 8, 15; 12:12). Therewith we discover unfriendliness to the many altars of the land (8:11; 10:2, 8; 12:12). The writer's allusions to the house of Yahweh seem to reveal favor for a central sanctuary and to suggest that there was but one whose

legitimacy was not questioned by him. He represents Yahweh as saying: "On account of the evil of their doings I will drive them from my house." I cannot agree with Dr. Harper, who says: "The house here is not the temple, but Palestine, the land of Israel,"²⁰ a remark which he consistently repeats in connection with most of the allusions to a house of Yahweh in the text of this book. I fail to see how any other house than the house of Yahweh in Jerusalem was meant; though it may not have been the temple of post-exilic Judaism. The reference to **בית יהוה** in 8:1 is found in a forceful simile; but the reference is all the more suggestive of the fact that the house of Yahweh to which he alluded was well known. In 9:4 it is said of the bread of mourning, or of their food which is like it, that it shall not come in the house of Yahweh. This is not, as Dr. Harper suggests, any place consecrated to Yahweh; but the temple itself, his house in Jerusalem.²¹ In 9:15, a passage alluded to above, it is evident that the prophetic writer felt that most of the people were unworthy to worship Yahweh in his house in Jerusalem. He seems to have been as interested in bringing the people to such a standard of conduct as would fit them for the new worship as the Deuteronomists were to make the temple and its worship in Jerusalem all that they felt it ought to be.

There is on the part of the writer hostility to idolatry in all its forms, such as only one imbued with the sentiments of Deuteronomists could be expected to manifest (8:4; 10:1 f.; 13:2). Then the thought of idolatry as whoredom, or infidelity to Yahweh, is especially deuteronomic (4:12; 5:4; 9:1, etc.; cf. Deut. 31:16; Exod. 34:15, which presumably are deuteronomic). While there is no reference in this prophetic book to the Levitical priesthood of the Deuteronomists, there is a horror of the priests who are scattered through the land that is itself deuteronomic. To the writer there is no God but Yahweh (13:4; cf. Deut. 5:7; 7:9, etc.). Forgetfulness of Yahweh is something with which this writer charges his people again and again (4:1, 6; 6:6; etc.). This the Deuteronomists abhorred (Deut. 6:12; 8:11; 9:23, etc.). Therewith is the thought of the evil of fullness or satiety as leading to such forgetfulness (12:9; 13:6; cf. Deut. 6:11f; 8:10-13). Then, too, there is an

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 339.

²¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 329.

unfriendliness to horses, perhaps for the same reason as the Deuteronomists abhorred them, because they were obtained from Egypt and seemed to bring with them a love of war and of Egyptian customs (14:4; cf. Deut. 17:16).

The writer's opposition to the professional prophetic class seems to be deuteronomic (4:5; 9:7 f.; cf. Deut. 13:1-5). The thought that by a prophet Yahweh brought his people out of Egypt is in harmony with Deut. 18:15 (12:14). There are other historical allusions that remind us of similar ones in Deuteronomy. There is the writer's mention of Baal-Peor, which is in the tone of a Deuteronomist, and of Admah and Zeboim (9:10; 11:8; cf. Deut. 4:3; 29:23).

Then, too, I find words and phrases which are characteristically deuteronomic: as שָׁקִיץ (9:10; cf. Deut. 29:16; I Kings 11:5, 7; II King 23:13, 24, all of which passages are deuteronomic. Even the verb which does not appear in J E is found in Deut.); and יִסּוּרוּ בִי (7:14; cf. Deut. 9:12; 11:16; 17:20); and כִּי מִרְחָה בְּאַלְהֵיהָ (14:1; cf. Deut. 1:26, 43; 9:7, 23); and חֵרוֹן אָפִי (11:9; cf. Deut. 13:18 and passages in the historical books which seem to have deuteronomic coloring). The verb, חָרָה, it should be noticed, is specially characteristic of the Deuteronomists. See also שָׂחָה (Hos. 9:9; 11:9; 13:9; cf. Deut. in which it is a very common verb). יִפְקֹד הַטְּאֵתִים of Hos. 9:9 (cf. 4:9, 14; 8:13; 12:3) reminds us of a deuteronomic phrase פָּקֵד עוֹן in Deut. 5:9 (cf. Exod. 20:5; 32:34; 34:7) which passages I take to be deuteronomic.

In his abstract conception of מִשְׁפָּט (5:1, 11; 10:4; 12:7) the writer finds no point of contact with the Deuteronomists; but when he speaks of Yahweh's מִשְׁפָּטִים he does (6:5; cf. Deut. 8:11; 11:1; 26:17, etc.). Then, too, the writer's attitude toward the תּוֹרָה is characteristically deuteronomic (4:6; 8:1, etc.; cf. Deut. 17:11-19; 27:26; 28:58, 61). Indeed, one wonders if we have not in Hos. 8:12, אֶכְתּוּב־לִי רֵבִי תוֹרָתִי, a reference to the deuteronomic codification. Surely the writer's concern for the covenant is deuteronomic (6:7; 8:1; 10:4; cf. Deut. 4:23; 5:2; etc.). Even in his hostility to a covenant with foreigners the writer shows his deuteronomic bent (12:2; cf. Deut. 7:2).

Finally there is another and most important reason which I have

for regarding Hosea as a late pseudepigraphic book. It is that by so regarding it we may retain as an integral part of it the messianic, the optimistic, or, as I prefer to call them, the zionistic passages because they were addressed to the *Golah* and intended to incite them to return. Modern scholars, like Wellhausen abroad and Harper and H. P. Smith at home reject these passages, looking upon them as indubitably late, as they are, and as additions to the text. While it may be admitted that they often seem abrupt, to break in twain the passages into which they are thrust; and even in some instances seem to contradict the messages of woe or doom which they follow, I am inclined to look upon them as what might be expected, as indeed the words which this writer, as I have intimated already, wished especially to say and to say most clearly and effectively. I have been led to surmise that the words of warning and of doom were more pessimistic than they need have been, that the author designed them to serve as a sort of dark background for his radiant zionistic pictures; not but that there were evils that moved him at times. We must take up, one by one, the more important zionistic passages in order to grasp this side of the writer's thought, determine its relation to his less joyous words and its bearing on questions having to do with the date and authorship of this little book.

Following the fateful words which the writer puts in the mouth of Yahweh in 1:9: "for ye are not my people, and I will not be your God," we have the sublime assurance: "Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered; and it shall come to pass, that, in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God. And the children of Judah and the children of Israel shall be gathered together, and they shall appoint themselves one head, and shall come up out of the earth; for great shall be the day of Jezreel." It is easy to see why this passage should be taken as a late insertion. In the first place, the transition from the preceding verse is very abrupt. Such a transition is not, however, to be avoided by deleting this passage, for in 2:3 we find: **אָמְרוּ לְאַחֵיכֶם עַמִּי וּלְאַהֲוֵיכֶם רַחֲמָה**. Then the passage has been rejected as a part of the original text, because it is a *Golah* passage, because it has to do with the scattered people of

both Israel and Judah, their return in large numbers to the land and their union as one nation under a single head. The deportations are in the distant past; the people have long been living abroad and presumably have been joined by thousands of their countrymen. The very fact that the "children of Judah" are mentioned as returning with the "children of Israel" is significant of a late date. But I prefer to retain the passage and to assume it to be one of many indications of the late composition of the entire book. I of course translate **וַעֲלוּ מִן־הָאָרֶץ**, "and they shall come up out of the earth," for **אָרֶץ** very frequently has this signification. It is noteworthy that **כִּי גָדוֹל יוֹם יוֹרֵעָאֵל** refers back to 1:4, 5 which relates how the supposed prophet was instructed to give his son symbolically the name **יֹרֵעָאֵל** (**אֵל** hath planted). As once the day of **יֹרֵעָאֵל** had been a day of great slaughter, so once again it is to witness a mighty deliverance. It is not the first thought that interests the writer, save that it may serve as a warning to the recreant people of his time, so much as it is the second thought that dominates his mind in writing this portion of his prophetic piece. In this assertion his thought for the time finds its culmination. All else is contributory to it.

The next zionistic passage is a long and inspiring one; but it can hardly be understood apart from the passages with which it is interwoven. It is found in 2:16-25; and may best be examined in parts. It will be noticed that it is a sort of expansion of 2:1, 2. Instead of repeating what he has already said, the writer amplifies the thought of that passage by giving certain details which are necessary to the perfectness of his picture. His instincts seemed to be those of a literary artist. He who throughout his work has many historical reminiscences seems just here to have in mind the old J E story of Yahweh's luring Israel from Egypt out into the wilderness where he could comfort and instruct the people. The people in foreign lands are being lured (this seems to be the force of the particip. **מִפְתִּיחַ**) and brought back by desert ways in which Yahweh who leads them may speak comforting words (2:16). Up through **עֲמֹק עֲכֹר לַפְתָּח** they are to come, he says (2:17). It is not likely that many of the *Golah* found their way home up through this vale, any more than it is that they lingered in desert places along the way; but the

poetic language, touched with reminiscences of the experiences of their fathers, would appeal to them. In the new day when Yahweh's people are restored to the land they are no longer to address him as **בעל**, a word long associated with another deity; but a term that has no such association is to be used (2:18 f.). Then the land is to be made secure as a place of abode; for a **בְּרִית** is to be made with all wild beasts and noxious reptiles (2:20a; cf. Isa. 11:6-9; Ezek. 34:25); the implements of war are also to be destroyed and an era of peace is to be inaugurated (2:20b; cf. Isa. 2:4; Ps. 72). This assurance of security (**וְהַשְׁכַּנְתִּים לְבִטָּחָה**) is one of the commonest in these *Golah* passages (Jer. 23:6; 32:37; 33:16; Ezek. 28:26; 34:25, 27 f.; 38:8, etc.). Like other prophetic writers who had much to say about the unsettled state of the land, this writer must draw a different picture of what was to be in the new day or he could not hope to lure home the *Golah*. In that time the people are to be betrothed to Yahweh forever, in a union which is not only to be closer but one which is to be ethical in character (2:21 f.). Like vss. 18 f. these verses link this passage indissolubly with what precedes 2:16. Yet the one verb, **אָרַשׁ**, which more than any other forms the link which binds this passage to the foregoing and at the same time gives the assertion its most distinctive character as a *Golah* passage is not found elsewhere in the prophetic writings. We are told that the result of this more intimate union of Yahweh with his people will be: **וַיִּדְעַת אֱתֵי-יְהוָה**. This, as we have seen, was considered by this prophet as a desideratum. The need of it appears in passages that are not zionistic. Then follows a passage, thoroughly characteristic of the *Golah* passages, in which there is assurance of abundant harvests in the new day (2:23 f.; cf. Amos 9:14; Ezek. 34:27; 36:30, etc.). The redeemed people are to be sown in the land and are to prosper as those upon whom Yahweh has had mercy and to whom in consequence he has become known (2:25). While this last verse is unmistakably zionistic it none the less surely links the passage in which it is found with what precedes it.

We come upon another radiant passage in 3:4 f. The children of Israel who live without rulers or chiefs of their own and without their idols and sacrifices can be none other than those scattered

abroad (3:4). **יָמִים רַבִּים** is an indefinite period; but it may stand for years if not for centuries. All this, however, is but preliminary to what follows, which has to do with the return and the re-establishment of the people under a new Davidic king: "afterward shall the children of Israel return and seek Yahweh their God, and David their king, and shall come with fear unto Yahweh and to his goodness in the latter days," 3:5. The preceding verse would hardly be explicable were it not for this; but this goes far beyond 2:1 f. in its assurances, especially in that it names the king as belonging to the house of David. This was one of the characteristic utterances of the zionistic thought (Jer. 30:9; Ezek. 34:23 f.). The fact that David is spoken of as "their king," whom they are to seek, is in harmony with 2:2 which alludes to the children of Judah and the children of Israel as coming together under one head. Wellhausen regards "David, their king," as a Judaic interpolation; but I cannot so consider it. The phrase "in the latter days" might seem to put the return in the remote future; but it need not be so regarded, for in other passages, admittedly late, it occurs as referring to an event in the near future (Isa. 2:2; Jer. 49:39).

In 6:1-3 we find the prophetic writer pleading with the people to return to Yahweh that he may heal them. They are assured that he will revive and bless them, even as the rain refreshes the earth. While this passage unquestionably has in mind primarily a moral and religious reformation, or return, it seems to be in the nature of an appeal to the *Golah* at the same time. The thought of healing seems to have been associated quite generally with the thought of the return (14:5; cf. Jer. 30:17; 33:6; Isa. 57:19). The verb **רפא** here seems to connect this verse with 5:13 where the people are reminded that they have not found healing abroad. The thought that the new day will be a time of abundance of rain is not novel (Ezek. 34:26). Nor is the thought that through Yahweh they are to be made to live (Ezek. 37:5-14; Zach. 10:9).

In 6:11b we unmistakably have a *Golah* passage **בשובי שבות** **עמי**, the brevity of which seems to increase its force; but what is specially conspicuous is its close connection with what precedes. There is to be a day of reckoning for Judah when the *Golah* is brought

back. Dr. Harper has to retain this,²² although he fails to grasp its real significance.

In 8:10a גַּם לִי יִתְּנוּ בְּגָדִים עֲתָה אֶקְבָּצֵם we have a zionistic passage which is closely connected with other parts of this little book; for friendliness to other powers and emigrations abroad are often, as we have seen, alluded to. Despite all this, we are told, Yahweh is to gather his people. There is no occasion for the latter assertion were it not for the preceding clause.²³ Even the latter part of the verse may be considered zionistic if it is rendered: "Now may they soon leave off the burden of the chief of rulers," i. e., the Persian satraps. Here, if we are right, the prophetic writer was mistaken; for the people long remained under foreign rule.

Very tender and reassuring is 11:11: "They shall come trembling as a bird out of Egypt, and as a dove out of the land of Assyria; and I will make them to dwell in their houses, saith Yahweh." While these words add little to the zionistic passages, they do reveal that the *Golah* scattered in all parts east and west are to be gathered. The verb הָרַד may not convey the thought of fear; it may have the force of "to hasten."

A noteworthy *Golah* passage is 13:14: "I will ransom them from the power of Sheol; I will redeem them from death: O death, where are thy plagues? O Sheol, where is thy destruction? vengeance shall be hid from mine eyes." Those who are living in foreign parts are conceived of as in Sheol, as dead. In Isa. 42:7, 22 the *Golah* are pictured as in prison. The Servant, or the True Israel, is to deliver them. In 53:8 he is spoken of as having been himself rescued from prison. In these passages it would seem the prison-house stands for the foreign lands in which the people were or had been scattered. It is likely that the grave, in which the Servant has been, is again the writer's conception of the exile. It certainly is unmistakable that the author of Ezek., chap. 37, regarded those of his people who resided abroad as dead, as in their graves, (vs. 12; cf. Isa. 26:19). The people so scattered are, our author tells us, to be redeemed. The thought of redemption, so characteristic of the *Golah* passage, and really latent in certain passages in this book, is the great thought

²² *Op. cit.*, p. 292.

²³ Harper, *op. cit.*, p. 318, where it is considered a late addition.

of this verse. The writer not only employs פרה, which occurs also in 7:13, but נסל, which does not appear elsewhere in this prophetic piece. Though the verse is a distinct addition to the zionistic thought of the book, we cannot say that it is really foreign thereto.

The whole of 14:2-9 is zionistic and is rejected by many modern scholars as late and manifestly foreign to the remainder of the book. It opens with a plea to return to Yahweh (vss. 2, 3). Even the words which the people are repentantly to repeat are put in their mouth. Though nothing is said directly of a return from foreign lands it is evident that the writer here as elsewhere had the thought of this double return in mind (cf. 3:5; 5:4; 6:1, 11; 7:10, 16, etc.). It certainly would be thoroughly in keeping with this writer's conception of the foreign-mania of his time to conceive it necessary for the people who come back to their fatherland to do so penitently as those who had wronged their God by going abroad.

In vss. 5 f., we are told what Yahweh will do in case his people respond to him. His anger being turned away he will love them and heal them. He will be to them as the dew, and so will cause them to flourish abundantly. The thought of Yahweh as the one who heals his people is a prominent thought of the book (6:1; 7:1; 11:3). Nor is the love of Yahweh for his people ignored (3:1; 11:1; cf. 9:15). The removal of his anger is elsewhere mentioned (11:9). But vs. 6 is unique in its poetic beauty among *Golah* passages. While a simile taken from the dew is in keeping with this prophetic book (6:4; 13:3), the verse is exceptional among the *Golah* passages not alone of this, but of all the prophetic books. As a result of Yahweh's favor and blessing in the new day, Israel, to whom the words are specially addressed, is to spread abroad. While the thought of the prosperity and growth of the people in the new era is not exceptional in the zionistic literature, here again we have the writer clothing his words with beautiful similes (vs. 7). In vs. 8 there is still another allusion to the return and the consequent revivifying of the people. The latter part of this verse is but an expansion of the thought of vs. 7. The remainder of the verse, though thoroughly appropriate, has not any special interest in this study. It may be granted that points of contact between almost any zionistic passage that might be selected at random and the

remainder of the book could be found; but I cannot forbear the conviction that we have here, as we have in other parts, in passages that are distinctively zionistic, an integral part of the book to which it is appended. To me such utterances are indubitably late; but they are parts of a book that need not be rejected, because it as a whole is late.

This little book is noteworthy because of its author's allusions to the folk-stories of the JE chronicles. These allusions are not always exact; nor are they always specially appropriate to the subject under discussion; but they are interesting and deserving of study (2:17; 11:1 ff.; 12:4 f., 13, etc.). While the dependence is chiefly upon J, it is not wholly; so that it is safe to say JE was known to the writer in substantially the form in which it has been passed on to us. What I am concerned to notice is that the allusions to incidents in the history of North Israel in the time to which the author assigns his book are of the same general character as his allusions to the legends of his people's past (9:17; 10:3, 7; 13:11, etc.). The passage 10:14 is specially to be examined because of its allusion to Shalmaneser IV. A tumult is to arise among the people; all the fortresses are to be spoiled, according as Shalmaneser spoiled Beth-Arbel in the day of battle. Although we are in doubt as to **בית ארבאל**, which seems to find mention in I Macc. 9:2, there is little doubt but that **שלמנ** is Shalmaneser IV, who besieged Samaria and harried North Israel, 724-722; and so prepared the way for the downfall of Samaria which was captured by Sargon in 721. The tone of this allusion is such as to suggest that it was remotely reminiscent. I prefer to regard it as another mark of the late date of the book rather than to look upon it, as some do, as a late insertion.

Of the linguistic argument I am not inclined to make much, although a score or more of late words, like **כנען** for merchant, and some words and forms which seem to be Aramaic appear, for it may be said, as Dr. Harper has remarked, that these may be taken as evidence of the North Israelitish origin of the book. Therefore I am content to pass by the linguistic argument, save as it has incidentally come up in the course of my discussion. Such data as I have presented have for several years seemed conclusive to me. They are here set forth in the hope that question of the date and authorship of the Book of Hosea may in view of them be reopened.